

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

**IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FIFTH APPELLATE DISTRICT**

In re A.H., a Person Coming Under the
Juvenile Court Law.

FRESNO COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF
CHILDREN & FAMILY SERVICES,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

B.H.,

Defendant and Appellant.

F058739

(Super. Ct. No. 07CEJ300234)

OPINION

THE COURT*

APPEAL from orders of the Superior Court of Fresno County. Jane Cardoza,
Judge.

Kathleen Murphy Mallinger, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for
Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

-ooOoo-

* Before Levy, Acting P.J., Cornell, J., and Gomes, J.

B.H. (father) appealed from an order terminating parental rights (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 366.26) to his two-year-old daughter.¹ After reviewing the entire record, father's court-appointed appellate counsel informed this court she had found no arguable issues to raise in this appeal. Counsel requested and this court granted leave for father to personally file a letter setting forth a good cause showing that an arguable issue of reversible error does exist. (*In re Phoenix H.* (2009) 47 Cal.4th 835.)

Father has since filed a letter. In it, he accuses social workers of being manipulative, vindictive, and discriminatory. However, he does not cite to any evidence in the record to support these accusations. Father also contends social workers did not provide full and proper services to provide his child a safe and sober home, again without any record citation to support his contentions. On review, we conclude father's letter does not amount to a good cause showing that an arguable issue of reversible error does exist.

DISCUSSION

An appealed-from judgment or order is presumed correct. (*Denham v. Superior Court* (1970) 2 Cal.3d 557, 564.) It is up to an appellant to raise claims of reversible error or other defect. The appellant has the burden of affirmatively showing error on the record and present argument and authority on each point made. (*Ibid.*) If an appellant does not do so, the appeal should be dismissed. (*In re Sade C.* (1996) 13 Cal.4th 952, 994.) Father does not raise any claim of error or other defect against the termination order he appealed from. Thus, we have no reason to reverse or even modify the orders in question. (*Ibid.*)

To the extent father complains about social workers in this case, his conclusory accusations, absent any affirmative showing in the record, are not enough to show an

¹ All statutory references are to the Welfare and Institutions Code unless otherwise indicated.

arguable issue of reversible error does exist. (*In re Phoenix H.*, *supra*, 47 Cal.4th 835; *Denham v. Superior Court*, *supra*, 2 Cal.3d at p. 564.)

At a termination hearing, such as the one in this case, the court's proper focus is on the child to determine whether it is likely he or she would be adopted and if so, order termination of parental rights. Once reunification services are ordered terminated, the focus shifts to the needs of the child for permanency and stability. (*In re Marilyn H.* (1993) 5 Cal.4th 295, 309.) Here the child is likely to be adopted. Therefore, termination of parental rights and adoption were presumed to be in the child's best interests. (*Ibid.*) Indeed, the law required the court to order adoption and its necessary consequence, termination of parental rights, unless one of the specified circumstances in section 366.26, subdivision (c)(1)(B), provided a compelling reason for finding that termination of parental rights would be detrimental to the child. (*In re Celine R.* (2003) 31 Cal.4th 45, 53.) Here, there was no compelling reason to order anything other than termination.

DISPOSITION

The order terminating parental rights is affirmed.